

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 3, 14, 27, and 32-33 are cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-26, and 28-31 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 2, 4-9, 15-17, 19-20, 22, and 28-29 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Title of the Invention. A revised title is submitted with the present Amendment.

Claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 12, 21, 25, 26, and 31 have been amended to correct the informalities, and claims 32-33 are cancelled. It is therefore submitted that claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-26, and 28-30 are in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Regarding the art rejections, claims 1-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Maruyama (translation of JP 11-187013). Claims 3, 14, 27, and 31-32 are cancelled. Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

Claim 1, as amended, calls for:

message data distributing means for distributing message data that includes data in which content is encrypted with a content key, data in which the content key is encrypted by a content encryption key, and a link to data in which the content encryption key is encrypted by the enabling key block (EKB) and to which other message data is linked, the content encryption key being said renewal node key.

(Emphasis added.)

Though Maruyama is concerned with encryption key distribution, the cited sections of the reference neither disclose nor suggest distributing message data having such a link, and the cited sections of Maruyama neither disclose nor suggest that other message data is linked to such data. It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Maruyama.

Claims 12, 21, 25, 26, and 31 have been similarly amended and are therefore distinguishable over Maruyama for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2 and 4-11 depend from claim 1, claims 13 and 15-20 depend from claim 12, claims 22-24 depend from claim 21, and claims 28-30 depend from claim 26. It is therefore submitted that each of these claims is distinguishable over Maruyama for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/009,076

Docket No.: SONYAK 3.3-162

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

655603_1.DOC